

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/066,060 | TEIG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Phallaka Kik | 2825 | |

All Participants:

(1) Phallaka Kik.

(2) Ali Makoui (Reg. No. 45,536).

Status of Application: Non-final rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 6 April 2006

Time: 3 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1-22

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated that the claims are subjected to a restriction requirement due to Applicant's amendment of the claims, wherein group I invention, claims 1-13, is directed to a method for specifying a topological routing solution and group II invention, claims 14-22, is directed to a computer program embedded on a computer readable medium for specifying a routing solution for a group of nets in an IC layout; wherein the inventions are related together as subcombinations useful together but have separate utilities and wherein the search for one invention is not required in the search for another invention.

In response, Applicant's Representative indicated that Applicant intended to file a continuation application anyway, and counter-proposes to amend claims 14-22 to have similar wordings as claims 1-13 so that the method and computer program claims can be prosecuted together. Accordingly, the Examiner agrees to allow Applicant to amend claims 14-22 to be similar to claims 1-13 instead of giving a restriction requirement, which has been filed by Applicant on 4/5/2006 as supplemental amendment.

In addition, Applicant's Representative also authorizes the Examiner to amend claims 6, 11, 13-15, 19 to overcome the minor informalities problems raised by the Examiner and to overcome the texts being cut-off on line 3 of claims 11 and 14 due to image scanning and/or faxing problems in the submitted supplemental amendment, as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment.

The Examiner also indicated that the specification and the drawings have minor informalities, wherein Figures 15, 28, 29, 31, 53 recited in the specification needs to be replaced with Figures 15A, 15B, 28A, 28B, 28C, 29A, 29B, 31A, 31B, 53A, 53B respectively, to reflect the changes that have been made to the replacement drawings as filed on 5/22/2002, and wherein the label "Figure 53" (found outside of the box in the drawing sheet) also needs to be changed to --Figure 53A--. In addition, the hyperlinks found on pages 51 and 89 also need to be removed. Accordingly, Applicant's Representative further authorizes the changes to the specification and the drawing as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment. As for the drawing, since the label "Figure 53" being changed to --Figure 53A-- is very minor, the Examiner has neatly made the amendment and uses it as the replacement sheet; therefore, Applicant is not required to submit a replacement sheet for this drawing sheet.